



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/858,398	05/16/2001	Xiqiang Yang	80867CPK	5321

7590

02/14/2003

Sarah Meeks Roberts  
Patent Legal Staff  
Eastman Kodak Company  
343 State Street  
Rochester, NY 14650-2201

EXAMINER

CHEA, THORL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1752

DATE MAILED: 02/14/2003

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/858,398

Applicant(s)

YANG ET AL.

Examiner

Thorl Chea

Art Unit

1752

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the corresponding address --

THE REPLY FILED January 29, 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.  
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:  
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);  
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.  
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: None.Claim(s) objected to: none.Claim(s) rejected: 1-44.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_



Thorl Chea  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit: 1752

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: It is the Examiner's position that the language "in the absence of thermal dye transfer" raises the issue of new matter such as set forth in the previous office action. The applicants argument traverses the rejection is directed to the "non-thermal dye transfer element", but the scope of the claimed invention encompasses any type of material including non-diffusion transfer dye element known in the art. The language "in the absence of thermal transfer dye" does not excluded the dye forming by the claimed dye providing coupler and blocked developer from transferring by other processing means such as disclosed on page 47 of the specification disclosure. The specification as a whole fails to disclose that the dye forming by the reaction product of dye providing coupler and the blocked developer is not a thermal dye transfer or the use of other type of dye which is not a thermal transfer dye. The absence of the thermal dye transfer in the claimed material has not been disclosed in the specification as originally filed and this language introduces a new concept to the specification. The whole concept disclosed in the specification is the use of the phenolic compound with an effective amount to release a developing agent from blocked developer to form a dye product between the dye providing coupler and the developing agent, whereas the claimed invention is directed to the use of thermal solvent to promote development which may include any development such as dye transfer etc. Moreover, the limitation such as "in absence of thermal transfer dye" fail to clearly differentiate the claimed material and prior art of record since the dye stays in the material in absence of heating process.